



2002-03 PERFORMANCE FUNDING REPORT

Standard 1B **PERFORMANCE FUNDING REPORT ON COLLEGE BASE RESULTS** **AND PILOT PROJECTS 2002-03**

A total of 690 graduates during fiscal year 2002-03 took one of three types of general education outcomes tests. Of those 690, 463 (67%) took the four-subject College BASE, the performance funding foundation test for Southwest. As a part of two different pilot projects, 192 (28%) took the one-subject College BASE, and 35 (5%) wrote essays based on topics to assess specific general education outcomes as well as writing skills. Because results in 2000-01 demonstrated that students tested at the Macon Campus tend to score higher on College BASE tests, relatively the same percentage of students were tested with each type of exam at Macon as were tested with the same type at the combined other sites.

1. PILOT OF COLLEGE BASE TESTS

For Year 3, 2002-03, of the performance funding cycle, Southwest continued to explore a shorter version of the College BASE exam as planned. However, rather than pilot a two-subject alternative of the College BASE as intended in August 2002, the College decided to continue with the one-subject College BASE for an additional year. This decision provided some challenging new information to help STCC in its goal to “identify and utilize the most useful assessment instruments to measure student proficiency and improve general education instruction” (Revised Plan for Standard 4B: Assessment Implementation).

The rationale for the change was the following:

1. Although students at Southwest had tended to score higher on the one-subject College BASE test than on the four-subject, the evidence was based on a small number of subject tests: 43 in social science, 44 in natural science, 52 in mathematics, and 57 in English. With another year of administering the test to 30% of graduates, the College could examine the consistency of the results.
2. With the additional information from the one-subject test in 02-03, the planned two-subject College BASE could still be piloted in 2003-2004.
3. Information gained in meetings planned with Testing Office personnel and with faculty in departments teaching subjects covered on the College BASE could further help in understanding why students at STCC have scored low on the College BASE, in gathering opinions on the advantages and disadvantages of the different versions of College BASE, and in charting the best course of action for general education assessment.

Comparison of 2001-02 and 2002-03 College BASE Results

The composite score of 240 for the four-subject foundation test for 2002-03 was the same as the composite score for 2001-02 for Southwest. Subject scores in science and social studies also remained the same; the subject score in Mathematics improved slightly (245 to 247) and the score for English declined slightly (237 to 233). See Table 1 for a comparison of College BASE composite and subject scores in the three years of Southwest's existence.

Table 1.
Comparison of Four-Subject College BASE Exam Results
2000-01, 2001-02, and 2002-03

	STCC 2000-01 4-Subject Test	STCC 2001-02 4-Subject Test	STCC 2002-03 4-Subject Test
Number of Tests	433	404	463
English	262	237	233
Math	251	245	247
Science	235	207	207
Soc. Stud.	249	226	226
Composite	260	240	240

In comparison to the Tennessee Reference Group, Southwest tends to be slightly lower (between 2 and 3 points) in its percentile rankings on the four-subject test in its composite, subject and cluster scores in 2002-03 than it was in 2001-02. See Table 2 on the 2001-02 and 2002-03 Comparison of Median Scores and Percentiles among Two-Year Institutions in the Tennessee Reference Group.

Table 2.
Comparison of Scores and Percentiles for Four-Subject
College BASE Examinations in 2001-02 and 2002-03

SUBJECT/Cluster	2001-02 Southwest Score	2001-02 Southwest Percentile *	2002-03 Southwest Score	2002-03 Southwest Percentile *
ENGLISH	237	25-26	233	28
Reading/Literature	241	27	232	27
Writing	258	33	254	33
MATH	245	28	247	30
General Math	255	31	259	33
Algebra	263	34-35	266	36
Geometry	242	25	247	30
SCIENCE	207	21-22	207	25
Lab/Field Techniques	217	25-26	216	27
Fund. Concepts	232	24	229	27
SOCIAL STUDIES	226	25	226	28
History	248	32-33	247	33
Social Sciences	222	22	221	25
COMPOSITE	240	27-28	240	31

* Percentiles require an estimation since the Assessment Resource Center that manages College BASE testing reported percentiles in five-point increments.

Comparison of 2002-03 Four-Subject and One-Subject Test Results

In 2002-03, the *composite scores* for the four-subject and piloted one-subject College BASE were almost the same: 240 for the four-subject and 238 for the one-subject. On the four-subject test, English scores were higher and math scores were significantly higher (at least a 17-point difference) than on the one-subject test. On the other hand, social studies scores were slightly lower and science scores were significantly lower on the one-subject test. See Table 3 for a complete comparison.

These mixed results do not reinforce earlier evidence that students at Southwest tend to score higher on the one-subject test than the four-subject.

Table 3.
Comparison of Four-Subject and One-Subject
College BASE Examinations in 2002-03

	STCC 2002 – 03 4-subject	STCC 2002 – 03 1-subject
# OF TESTS	463	192**
ENGLISH	233	219 (45)
MATH	247	225 (46)
SCIENCE	207	241 (48)
SOC. STUDIES	226	230 (53)
COMPOSITE	240	238 (192)

**The number of students who took each subject test is given in parentheses after the scores for each subject for the one-subject tests.

One-Subject Results From Three Pilots

Results from three administrations of the one-subject form of College BASE, two with larger numbers of students (169 and 192) and one with only 27, lacked any discernable pattern (except for the higher scores in science on the one-subject test, which will be discussed later). It may have been that the smaller number of students taking the one-subject form made the results undependable as information for how all graduating students would perform if they took the short form, especially since four students were needed to gain the same information as one student taking the long form. See Table 4 for the comparison of one-subject results from Fall/Spring 2000-01, Summer 2001, and FY 2002-03.

Table 4.
Comparison of One-Subject
College BASE Examinations from Three Pilots

	Fall 2000F & Spring 2001	Summer 2001	Fiscal Year 2002-03
# OF TESTS**	169	27	192
ENGLISH	243 (51)	259 (6)	219 (45)
MATH	236 (44)	204 (8)	225 (46)
SCIENCE	256 (38)	243 (6)	241 (48)
SOC. STUDIES	261 (36)	322 (7)	230 (53)
COMPOSITE	257 (169)	261 (27)	238 (192)

**The number of students who took each subject test is given in parentheses after the scores for each subject for the one-subject tests.

Analysis of College BASE Process and Results

In Fall 2002 the coordinator of general education met with personnel in the testing office at the two campuses and with faculty from the departments that teach courses with material directly covered by the College BASE tests. The underlying purpose of the meetings was for faculty to review sample College BASE tests supplied by the Missouri Assessment Resource Center and to recommend means of improving student results on the College BASE. Testing personnel considered the conditions under which students take the College BASE. The faculty examined sample tests to compare the essential skills and knowledge addressed in general education courses with what the College BASE examination covered.

Testing Personnel Reviews. Two meetings were held, one with testing personnel from the Macon campus and one with the Union campus staff. The meetings focused on student motivation, on how the test is presented to students, and on the conditions in which students take the tests. Conclusions and suggestions from those meetings address *the testing environment*:

1. All students tested should take relatively the same length of test rather than tests of different lengths. Testing reported that student awareness of the different lengths of different tests has increased every year since it began in 2000-01, and more students are voicing resentment.
2. Problems with lighting, noise, temperature and space for tests may have affected some of the results.
3. Both faculty and the testing staff should work to create more acceptance of the test by students, but students may remain reluctant to expend extra energy on a test that doesn't affect them in a clear and direct way.

Faculty Reviews. A series of College BASE review meetings were held with faculty from science (four faculty attending), social sciences (eight faculty participating from three meetings and conferences), English (eight faculty attending), mathematics (five attending), and allied health and nursing (two attending). In meetings with faculty, the following goals were set:

1. To describe similarities and differences between College Base skills and course material;
2. To consider whether changes should be encouraged in teaching strategies or emphases;
3. To consider whether some other type of assessment of courses is needed;
4. To consider whether there are other courses at the college that could reinforce the skills tested on the exam; and
5. To report findings to appropriate departments, deans, and assessment and planning personnel for possible changes.

Several conclusions responded to the *nature of the questions* for each section of the College BASE:

1. Test questions in English, science and social studies tended to be ones faculty would like their students to be able to solve or to know. Math, however, noted that most of the math skills on the test were developmental rather than college-level. Math may need to look for other measurements of student performance in their general education courses.
2. Many test questions in science and social studies were interdisciplinary, and students may have learned the information and developed the skills in a variety of courses.
3. Students could not have taken the variety of courses necessary to answer all the information questions.
4. So much of the test depended on reading skills that all classes strengthen that key component should help students' general education performances.

Science was the area in which student performance on the College BASE was significantly lower than in other areas of the College in 2000-01. In 2001-02, scores declined in the other subjects. For that reason, science addressed the task more carefully and moved from a discussion to a plan of action for course improvement in 2003-2004. Science faculty have agreed on the following *strategies for course improvement*:

1. Faculty in science should include more critical thinking questions on tests.
2. Teaching material that involves an interdisciplinary understanding of the sciences should be included in courses.
3. More attention should be paid to teaching the scientific method.
4. Science should attempt to coordinate activities with related areas like allied health in order to improve science skills across the college.

Implementation of Two-Section College BASE Testing Process

Finally, one conclusion stems both from discussions with testing, faculty in departments, and the college's General Education Committee.

Southwest should administer shorter forms of the College BASE rather than the long four-subject version, especially in light of student unhappiness over different lengths of tests. The length of the test may be affecting performance on the more difficult sections of the test, especially science. The college decided against offering only one-section College BASE tests because the smaller sample size (approximately 175 students per section) would not provide an acceptable confidence level. By offering a two-section test to all students, the college would receive approximately 350 scores per section with a 95% confidence level on the results. The 90-minute test would also eliminate problems caused by some students taking a three-hour test while others took a 45-minute version.

2. PILOT OF ESSAY WRITING EXIT EXAM

Goals for 2002-03 Essay Pilot Test

1. Analysis of sample papers with new prompts and comparison of the results with those of previous years;
2. Analysis of sample papers with new prompts to see effectiveness in assessing outcomes besides ones related to communication;
3. Analysis of sample papers with new prompts to see effectiveness of analytic scoring;
4. Decision about whether to adjust prompts, rubrics, or information-gathering devices for assessing outcomes besides ones related to communication, or whether to focus on the writing samples for effective writing only;
5. Sample 5% of graduating students with prompts that follow the decision described above;
6. Decide whether we should test a larger percentage of students with the writing test.

Faculty continued to use topics based on three specific general education outcomes, related to (1) consideration of alternative hypotheses, (2) ethical behavior and (3) effect of diversity on ideas and behavior. Five percent (5%) of graduating students taking a general education exit exam, 35 students from the Summer, Fall and Spring together, wrote essays based on a choice of three topics. Two of the topics from 2001-02 were continued, but the diversity topic was changed.

Because of poorer student performance on the diversity topic in 2001-02 than on the other two topics, and because the scorers were also more inconsistent in their judgments on the diversity papers, a new diversity topic was used in the Fall semester. It was more concrete than the previous year in order to parallel better the other two topics. However, no student wrote on the new topic in the Fall. They also they didn't write on a revision of the previous year's topic for the Spring essays. The only paper on diversity in the pilot was written in Summer 2002 from the previous fiscal year's topic.

Faculty used rubrics for scoring student performance – a separate but similar rubric for each of the three chosen topics. The rubrics include competencies of two types to use as criteria for levels of performance: one based on the particular topic and the other based on writing skills, with the latter being used in all three of the rubrics. They were the same as for the previous year

except the rating “Unable to Decide” was eliminated since scorers the previous year did not find it necessary.

Faculty participated in a workshop conducted to discuss how to use the rubrics. Three papers clearly distinguishable in overall level of performance were read and scored by everybody, and then discussed. Afterwards, all 35 papers were scored by two or three participants each in the workshop.

Information was charted to show how often student performance on the particular criteria in the rubric was scored as *excellent*, *satisfactory*, or *unsatisfactory*. Because only one paper on diversity was included, it is not a part of the following results. For 77% of the competency criteria (10 of 13), at least 80% of the papers were scored as at least *satisfactory*. For both Topic 1 and Topic 2, the weakest criteria were the ones identified as “maintains standard English.” For all other criteria, the range of at least *satisfactory* was between 69% and 90% of scores, and only one of those was below 77%. It was 62% for the “maintains standard English” criteria for both topics. See the attached table on the General Education Exit Essay Exam for complete results for each competency and topic, including a comparison to last year’s results.

It was difficult to compare the two years’ results on the essay exam. First, the responses to the diversity topic were significantly weaker in 2001-02, but students did not write on it in 02-03. Secondly, the scorers were made up of different people in the two periods, and further examination would be necessary to see whether their scoring was similar in level of expectation. It can be stated, however, that 78% of totals for topic one were at least *satisfactory* in 02-03 in contrast to 94% in 01-02. For topic two, 82% were at least *satisfactory* in 02-03 in contrast to 88% in 01-02. From all scores, 80% in 02-03 were at least *satisfactory* compared to 85% in 01-02. Although this figure is 5% lower for 02-03, it still seems an acceptable percentage of *satisfactory* or *excellent* scores.

The following table compares the totals for the three levels of *excellent*, *satisfactory*, and *unsatisfactory* for all competencies combined together for FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03.

Table 5.
Essay Writing Exit Exam
Levels of Performance for All Competencies Combined
2001-02 and 2002-03

Fiscal Year	Number Excellent	Percentage Excellent	Number Satisfactory	Percentage Satisfactory	Number Unsatisfactory	Percentage Unsatisfactory	Total
FY 01	122	29%	229	55%	63	15%	414
FY 02	91	20%	267	60%	88	20%	446

Workshop discussions and a questionnaire sent to all participants in the Essay Writing Project for the first three years of 5-year cycle provided decision-making information about whether to continue this part of the performance funding pilot project. This was particularly important because the learning outcomes addressed by the essays were interdisciplinary, but the learning outcomes for the Fall 2004 TBR general education core would be discipline-oriented.

The questionnaire included the following three questions and responses. Of 13 faculty participants, 9 returned questionnaires.

1. I believe that an essay writing exam should be administered to all graduating students instead of a standardized test like the College Base.

(a) Strongly agree 1 (b) Agree 1 **(c) Disagree 6** **(d) Strongly disagree 1**

2. I believe that an essay writing exam of the type given graduating students in the performance funding writing project, but with specific course outcomes in mind, could be administered on the departmental level usefully, especially if only a sample of the essays were scored and the exams were created and approved by the department itself.

(a) Strongly agree 1 **(b) Agree 6** (c) Disagree 2 (d) Strongly disagree 0

3. I believe that an essay writing exam of the type given graduating students in the performance funding writing project, but with specific course outcomes in mind, would NOT be a useful assessment instrument for most departments.

(a) Strongly agree 0 (b) Agree 1 **(c) Disagree 6** **(d) Strongly disagree 1** (1 omitted)

From these results, participants believed that criteria-referenced scoring of essays would be more useful at the departmental level than as an assessment device for all graduating students. The most commonly expressed problem with the scoring was the amount of time that it takes, though the difficulty of assessing a wide range of learning outcomes consistently was also identified.

3. 2003-04 PILOT TESTING PLAN

College BASE Testing:

The College plans to administer the two-subject form of the College BASE to all graduating students in 2003-2004. Students will either take the English and science portions of the test, or they will take the math and social studies portion. Therefore, no student will take only English and mathematics together (what are often considered skills tests), and no student will take the more-closely related math and science portions.

- a) With all students taking the same length of test, the student complaints about the different lengths of required testing will be resolved. Testing personnel observed that these complaints increased each year as students heard about the tests from classmates and friends, and the increased dissatisfaction may have affected test results.
- b) By using the two-subject test rather than the one-subject, each student will have a more balanced combination of skills tested.
- c) With the increased number of tests, the confidence the College can have in test results will be improved. This confidence is particularly important given the erratic results of the piloted one-subject College BASE test in the past.

- d) Because of the difficulty of trusting the results on tests piloted by 30% of graduating students, the College now feels that it is best to explore what happens when all students take the same test.
2. As a *pilot activity*, the College will analyze the results of the two-subject test and compare them to the one-subject and four-subject results from previous years in the cycle.
3. In addition, the General Education Coordinator or Committee will conduct follow-up reviews and discussions of the College BASE test with faculty in English and the Department of Social Sciences to help those areas develop departmental recommendations for teaching strategies similar to ones initiated in science in 2002-03.

Essay Writing

1. For the *essay exam pilot activity*, the College will re-examine papers from the previous two years to see whether faculty scorers are rating papers consistently. This problem can be addressed in part by having some faculty from two years ago score some of last year's papers, by having some of last year's scorers rate papers from two years ago, and by comparing results with earlier ratings. In addition, in response to requests from the 2002-03 workshop on criteria-reference scoring, the new ratings may include an overall rating for a paper separate from the ratings for individual criteria.
2. In addition, the General Education Committee or faculty participants in the essay writing project will work with academic departments to see whether the departments can use criteria-referenced scoring as a part of their assessment efforts for the new TBR general education core.

Southwest Tennessee Community College
2002-03 Performance Funding Report

**ATTACHMENTS FOR STANDARD 1B
PILOT EVALUATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOME MEASURES**

1. College Base Scores for Southwest Tennessee Community College Students and Percentiles Among Two-Year Institutions in Tennessee Reference Group (FY01, FY02, FY03)
2. Directions for General Education Essay Writing Test
3. Faculty Forms for Criteria-Referenced Evaluation of Essays
4. Results of Faculty Essay Scoring (FY01, FY02)

**SOUTHWEST TENNESSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE BASE 2000-2001, 2001-2002 and 2002-2003**

**MEDIAN SCORES AND PERCENTILES AMONG TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
TENNESSEE REFERENCE GROUP**

The COMPOSITE MEAN for the two-year college Tennessee Reference Group was 275 in 2000-2001, 274 in 2001-2002 and 271 in 2002-2003.

SUBJECT/Cluster	4-subject 00-01 SCORE (433 tests)	4-subject 00-01 percentile	1-subject 00-01 SCORE*	1-subject 00-01 percentile	4-subject 01-02 SCORE (404 tests)	4-subject 01-02 percentile **	4-subject 02-03 SCORE (463 tests)	4-subject 02-03 percentile	1-subject 02-03 SCORE*	1-subject 02-03 percentile
ENGLISH	262	40	243 (51)	28	237	25-26	233	28	219 (45)	20
Reading/Literature	269	43	243 (51)	26	241	27	232	27	218 (45)	19
Writing	277	45	267 (51)	38	258	33	254	33	244 (45)	27
MATH	251	32	236 (44)	22	245	28	247	30	225 (46)	17
General Math	264	38	267 (44)	40	255	31	259	33	274 (46)	43
Algebra	270	39	255 (44)	30	263	34-35	266	36	241 (46)	24
Geometry	258	35	232 (44)	18	242	25	247	30	213 (46)	12
SCIENCE	235	34	256 (38)	47	207	21-22	207	25	241 (48)	42
Lab/Field Techniques	236	34	279 (38)	60	217	25-26	216	27	263 (48)	53
Fund. Concepts	262	39	256 (38)	35	232	24	229	27	233 (48)	29
SOCIAL STUDIES	249	40	261 (36)	48	226	25	226	28	230 (53)	30
History	261	41	272 (36)	50	248	32-33	247	33	249 (53)	34
Social Sciences	253	39	266 (36)	49	222	22	221	25	234 (53)	32
COMPOSITE MEAN	260	41	257 (169)	40	240	27-28	240	31	238 (192)	30

* Number of tests in parentheses for each subject and cluster score.

** Percentiles require some amount of estimation since ARS (College Base) reported them in 5-point increments.

GENERAL EDUCATION ESSAY WRITING TEST

(75 minutes)

I. DIRECTIONS:

This is a test of your ability to write a well-organized essay in which you use details to support a point. The essay must also be a clear response to one of three stated prompts or topics. A typical essay falls in the range of 250 – 400 words in length.

Procedures:

1. First, jot down ideas, notes, or other plans so that your essay will be well organized.

(about 10 minutes)

2. Write the essay itself, making sure it has the following elements:

- An introduction
- A body with concrete details and examples
- A conclusion

The actual number of paragraphs may vary from student to student.

(about 50 minutes)

3. Proofread and edit the essay carefully for errors in grammar, mechanics, spelling, and other aspects of standard written English. It is not necessary to recopy the essay.

(about 15 minutes)

If you have time left over at the end, use it for extra proofreading.

- ### II. TOPICS OR PROMPTS – Select **one** of these three topics or prompts (1, 2 or 3). Make sure that you address what your choice of topic or prompt asks you to address.

1. Two students attend the same class at the same time with the same instructor. The first describes the class as boring and useless, while the second calls the class interesting and helpful.
 - a) Describe at least two different explanations of the students' different responses.
 - b) Identify some probable consequences of their different views.

OVER – TOPICS 2 AND 3 ARE ON THE BACK OF THIS SHEET.

2. A student finds an essay published on the Internet, copies it, and submits it in class as his own work. He receives an A for the assignment.

- a) What are the consequences for the student?
 - b) What are the consequences for his or her classmates?
 - c) What are the consequences for the community?
3. Read the following hypothetical situation and write your paper in response to the questions that follow it.

Situation:

A college in which 10% of the students are Muslim has a Muslim Students Association. The group is asking the Student Government Association, of which you are a member, for money to bring a speaker, and the speaker has been openly critical of what he calls the American government's "anti-Islamic" policies in the Middle East. The Muslim Students Association has pointed out that the amount they need is less than 10% of the SGA's budget for speakers.

Questions:

- a) Based on the information above, could you vote "yes" in favor of the proposal for money or "no" in opposition to the proposal? What reasons would you give for your "yes" or "no" position, or what reasons would you give for being unable to make a decision?
- b) What arguments would you expect in opposition to your position, and would you expect the arguments to represent different groups and communities, or to represent individual opinions?
- c) In order to make a more informed decision, what questions would you ask the Muslim Students Association, or what information would you seek to learn?

Scorer's initials _____ Paper number _____

GENERAL EDUCATION CRITERIA-REFERENCED EVALUATION FORM
TOPIC 1 2002-2003

Two students attend the same class at the same time with the same instructor. The first describes the class as boring and useless, while the second calls the class interesting and helpful.

- a) Describe at least two different explanations of the students' different responses.
- b) Identify some probable consequences of their different views.

A. COMPETENCIES

RATINGS

Identify the level of performance of each of the criteria listed below.	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Describes at least two different explanations of the students' different responses. (alternative hypotheses)			
2. Identifies some probable consequences of their different views.			
3. Addresses the assigned topic			
4. Organizes ideas			
5. Develops ideas with examples, illustrations, or evidence			
6. Maintains standard English			

Scorer's Comments:

Scorer's initials _____ Paper number _____

GENERAL EDUCATION CRITERIA-REFERENCED EVALUATION FORM
TOPIC 2 2002-2003

A student finds an essay published on the Internet, copies it, and submits it in class as his own work. He receives an A for the assignment.

- a) What are the consequences for the student?
- b) What are the consequences for his or her classmates?
- c) What are the consequences for the community?

A. COMPETENCIES

RATINGS

Identify the level of performance of each of the criteria listed below.	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Discusses the issue of using the Internet paper in terms of ethical behavior (ethical issues and behavior)			
2. Goes beyond statements of opinion to develop a convincing argument. (ethical issues and behavior)			
3. Discusses consequences to all three groups – student, class, community.			
4. Addresses the assigned topic			
5. Organizes ideas			
6. Develops ideas with examples, illustrations, or evidence			
7. Maintains standard English			

Scorer's Comments: Do you think that the topic should more directly encourage students to address ethical issues?

Scorer's initials _____ Paper number _____

GENERAL EDUCATION CRITERIA-REFERENCED EVALUATION FORM
TOPIC 3 Fall 2001 – Summer 2002

Discuss how human diversity affects ideas and behavior. *Human diversity* refers in particular to the existence of different groups or communities with different background or points of view. *Human diversity* may include differences in race, gender, sexual preference, ethnicity, religion, politics, or geography (where someone lives or grows up). Be sure to include specific examples of human diversity's influences on ideas and behavior, and when possible show how courses or experiences at STCC have helped you to understand the relationship between diversity and behavior.

A. COMPETENCIES

RATINGS

Identify the level of performance of each of the criteria listed below.	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1. Shows how human diversity affects ideas.			
2. Shows how human diversity affects behavior.			
3. Understands and discusses diversity as something separate from individuality.			
4. Addresses the assigned topic			
5. Organizes ideas			
6. Develops ideas with examples, illustrations, or evidence			
7. Maintains standard English			

Scorer's Comments: Does the student show how courses or experiences at STCC have helped him or her understand the relationship between diversity and behavior? Yes / No

Comments:

GENERAL EDUCATION EXIT ESSAY EXAM
Distribution of FY 2002-2003 Criteria-Referenced Scores and Comparison to FY 2001-2002

For the competency referred to by the numbers in the left hand column (1-6 for Topic 1, for example), see the sample Evaluation Forms for a description of the competency.

The results represent two scores for each competency on each essay even if the essay was scored by three faculty. The two more similar scores were used. In cases where the three scores differed – one E (excellent), one S (satisfactory), and one U (unsatisfactory), the table uses the middle score and counts both scores as S. There are 11 E/U splits among scorers from 224 possibilities, or 5% of the total.

From the 446 separate scores, 358, or 80%, are at least at the *satisfactory* level. This compares to 85% in FY 2001-2002.

The table includes a comparison between percentages of each rank of score (E, S, U) for each competency for FY02-03 and FY01-02.

E = excellent

S = satisfactory

U = unsatisfactory

T = total(s)

Topic 1 competencies	# E FY 02	% E FY 02	% E FY 01	# S FY 02	% S FY 02	% S FY 01	# U FY 02	% U FY 02	% U FY 01	T FY 02
1.	10	24%	44%	19	45%	48%	13	31%	8%	42
2.	6	14%	28%	27	64%	56%	9	21%	16%	42
3.	6	14%	44%	31	74%	52%	5	12%	4%	42
4.	7	17%	36%	26	62%	60%	9	21%	4%	42
5.	2	5%	32%	35	85%	68%	4	10%	0%	41*
6.	6	14%	24%	20	48%	68%	16	38%	8%	42
1 Totals	37	15%	35%	158	63%	59%	56	22%	6%	251
Topic 2 competencies	# E FY 02	% E FY 02	% E FY 01	# S FY 02	% S FY 02	% S FY 01	# U FY 02	% U FY 02	% U FY 01	T FY 02
1.	4	15%	31%	16	62%	62%	6	23%	6%	26
2.	6	23%	31%	17	65%	43%	3	12%	25%	26
3.	10	38%	47%	12	46%	41%	4	15%	12%	26
4.	10	38%	35%	12	46%	53%	4	15%	12%	26
5.	8	31%	35%	15	58%	59%	3	12%	6%	26
6.	4	16%	29%	19	76%	53%	2	8%	18%	25*
7.	2	8%	16%	14	54%	71%	10	38%	6%	26
2 Totals	44	24%	33%	105	58%	55%	32	18%	12%	181
Topic 3 competencies	# E FY 02	% E FY 02	% E FY 01	# S FY 02	% S FY 02	% S FY 01	# U FY 02	% U FY 02	% U FY 01	T FY 02
1.	2	100%	14%	0	0%	48%	0	0%	38%	2
2.	2	100%	19%	0	0%	43%	0	0%	38%	2
3.	2	100%	19%	0	0%	67%	0	0%	14%	2
4.	2	100%	19%	0	0%	52%	0	0%	29%	2
5.	0	0%	14%	2	100%	71%	0	0%	14%	2
6.	2	100%	33%	0	0%	43%	0	0%	24%	2
7.	0	0%	29%	2	100%	43%	0	0%	29%	2
3 Totals	10	71%	21%	4	29%	52%	0	0%	27%	14
Totals for all topics	91	20%	29%	267	60%	55%	88	20%	15%	446

*One score omitted by scorer.